DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 037 SP 026 730

AUTHOR Parker, Linda S.; Gilbert, Kathryn M.
TITLE Wisconsin's Teaching Incentives Pilot Program.
INSTITUTION Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
PUB DATE Apr 85
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Career Ladders; *Improvement Programs; *Incentives; Pilot Projects; *Program Development; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Incentives Pilot Program; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

In response to recommendations by a task force on teaching and teacher education, the state of Wisconsin established the Teacher Incentives Pilot Program. The goal of the program is to plan, develop, and administer a series of pilot projects which model different types of incentives designed to attract, prepare, and retain competent teachers. These include: (1) incentives and innovations for training new teachers and for staff development; (2) incentives for retaining teachers in their profession through the development of career ladder structures; (3) incentives for retaining teachers through monetary and nonmonetary awards; and (4) combinations which link the three levels of incentives. Three principles direct the thrust of the pilot program: (1) communication and cooperation among the different systems of education (teacher preparation institutions, K-12 school systems, the state education agency responsible for teacher education, employment, and continued professional development); (2) joint planning and action at the local school district level (teachers, administrators, school board and other community members); and (3) assessment and evaluation of individual and institutional educational outcomes. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262037

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction

Teaching Incentives Pilot Program

Madison, Wisconsin

WISCONSIN'S TEACHING INCENTIVES PILOT PROGRAM

Linda S. Parker and Kathryn M. Gilbert

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Parker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.

April 1985

Kathryn M. Gilbert, Program Director
Linda S. Parker, Associate Director

SP026730

WISCONSIN'S TEACHING INCENTIVES PILOT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

The Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction is committed to the principle that one of the most effective ways to improve the education provided Wisconsin's elementary and secondary students is to improve the quality of classroom teaching. Toward that end, Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, appointed a 22-member task force in November 1982 to undertake a thorough review of teaching and teacher education in Wisconsin and to recommend policies and procedures which would enhance the quality of teaching in Wisconsin. This task force, the State Superintendent's Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education, was composed of a diverse group of Wisconsin citizens, educators, and business leaders. The task force submitted its final report and recommendations in January 1984.

Over the 14 months of its work, the task force found, according to its final report, that the teacher is the key to success in our public education system. The report said:

> Of all the elements which together comprise Wisconsin's educational system, none is more important than the classroom teacher. It will matter little what else we do, or how much money we spend on other elements of the educational system unless we have able, dedicated, effective teachers in Wisconsin's classrooms (Grover, 1984).

Paul Hassett, task force chair and president of the Wisconsin Association of Manufacturers and Commerce, singled out several of the 31 recommendations contained in the task force report as being especially significant. Among them were the following:

1. Establishment of a career ladder for advancement within the teaching profession;
2. Establishment of criteria and procedures for regular supervision and evaluation of the performance of all licensed professional educators;
3. Adoption of tougher requirements for admission to and completion of teacher preparation programs;
4. Provision of more help and guidance to beginning teachers.

Wisconsin's response to the challenge of the final report of the Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education was the establishment in December 1984 of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program. The goal of the program is to plan, develop, and administer a series of pilot projects which model different types of incentives designed to attract, prepare, and retain competent teachers. These include: (a) incentives and innovations for training new teachers and for staff development; (b) incentives for retaining teachers in their profession through the development of career ladder structures; (c) incentives for retaining teachers through monetary and nonmonetary awards; and (d) combinations which link the three levels of incentives.

Three principles direct the thrust of the pilot program: (a) communication and cooperation among the different systems of education (teacher preparation institutions, K-12 school system, the state education agency) responsible for teacher education, employment, and continued professional development; (b) joint planning and action at the local district level (teachers, administrators, school board and other community members); and (c) assessment and evaluation of individual and institutional educational outcomes and processes.

PHASE I - PLANNING OF THE TEACHING INCENTIVES PILOT PROGRAM

A federal grant of $117,000 awarded by the Secretary's Discretionary Fund, U.S. Department of Education, in 1983 enabled Wisconsin's Department of Public Instruction to initiate the first phase of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program. This initial stage of the program involved a statewide effort to inform school districts and educators about the many incentive choices available for attracting, preparing, and retaining competent teachers. This endeavor included the development and distribution of printed materials as well as informational presentations at state and regional educational interest group meetings by members of the Incentives Program staff.

Another major Phase I activity was a series of regional orientation meetings held in June of 1984 which served to bring together representatives from interested school districts (i.e., teachers, administrators, and school board members), institutions of higher education, and other interested parties to provide an orientation to the Incentives Program. Information was presented regarding the Task Force recommendations and their relevance to the Incentives Program. Incentives project options in the three categories--training level incentives, career ladder, and awards for excellence--were explained. Distribution of application materials for pilot project participation took place at the regional meetings. (See Appendix for copy of application materials.)

Districts were informed of the application process at the regional meetings. Each district was required to develop a School District Development Council consisting of teachers, community members, school board members, administrators, and university representatives. The intent was to involve in the planning process those constituent groups that would be affected by a pilot program in the district/community. Districts

that intended to submit proposals for consideration were required to send a "letter of intent" to Incentives Program staff by August 15, 1984. The "letter of intent" served as an indication that the district was interested in developing a proposal for a pilot project. Three signatures were required in the letter--that of the district administrator, the school board president, and the president of the local teachers' association.

School districts were informed that there would be three deadlines for submitting proposals. Proposals would be accepted August 15, 1984; October 1, 1984; and December 1, 1984. Staggered submittal dates were used because of the time factor and the varying levels of readiness of local districts. Many districts were not going to be able to begin work on their proposals until school reconvened in the fall, whereas others were able to meet throughout the summer. Furthermore, the advisory board for the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program felt there was not sufficient time between the regional meetings and the August 15 deadline for all districts to develop a comprehensive proposal.

School districts were informed that funding of the pilot project would depend upon how much money is appropriated for the 1985-87 biennial budget by Wisconsin's legislature. Funding of the projects by the state might be anywhere from 50 percent to 100 percent. Thus, districts were aware from the beginning that there was no guarantee of state funding.

Approximately sixty districts sent representatives to the regional meetings held throughout the state. Following these meetings, each district was telephoned to determine the level of interest. Those districts that indicated a high level of interest were given extensive technical assistance by the Incentives Program staff. Technical assistance varied with district needs/requests and included:

1. Maintaining contact by telephone;
2. Making presentations to teachers and/or School District Development Council meetings;
3. Attending School District Development Council meetings to provide input and answer questions;
4. Meetings with school district administrators and/or persons responsible for proposal development;
5. Reading of initial drafts of proposals and providing feedback.

Of the sixty districts that attended the regional meetings, 30 sent a "letter of intent" and four districts submitted a proposal by the August 15 deadline. Incentives Program staff then visited all interested districts between August 15 and the end of September 1984 to check on progress and to provide assistance in the proposal development process.

Interested school districts/education agencies that developed and submitted a proposal addressed the following topics in their proposals:

1. Statement concerning the need for the selected teaching incentives pilot program;
2. Statement of the goals/objectives of the proposed incentives program;
3. Description of the proposed incentives pilot program;
4. Description of the planning process that was utilized to develop the proposal;
5. Description of the implementation plan;
6. Description of the program evaluation process/procedures to be used;
7. Project budget;
8. Project accountability.

Rigorous procedures were utilized for selection of the pilot sites. Incentives Program staff visited districts that submitted proposals and interviewed five individuals--a teacher involved in the planning process, a teacher not involved in the planning process, an administrator involved in the planning process, an administrator not involved in the planning process, and a school board member. The purpose of the on-site interview was to determine the level of local district commitment to the project. In addition, it was necessary for a majority of the local teachers' association membership to vote in favor of the proposal before it could be considered for selection. It was also a requirement that the local school board vote in favor of supporting a district incentives project.

Efforts during Phase I of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program have been guided by an advisory board that was appointed in January 1984 by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. This advisory board continued the broad representation of the Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education. The chair of the advisory board is the director of the Bureau for Policy and Budget, Department of Public Instruction. Other members include the presidents of both the Wisconsin Federation of Teachers and the Wisconsin Education Association Council, the executive secretary of the Wisconsin Association of School Boards, the chair of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, two principals, a district administrator, a representative of the business community, and a parish priest who is a former president of a private college. The advisory board has been responsible for developing the policies, criteria, and procedures that guided the selection process and approval of pilot proposals.

The initial planning phase of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program culminated on December 1, 1984, when a total of 17 proposals were submitted to the advisory board for consideration. The major reasons that half of the original 34 districts did not submit proposals were: failure to obtain approval of the proposal from the local teachers'

association, insufficient time, and inability to reach consensus on the type of proposal to be submitted.

Concurrent with the selection process, the Department of Public Instruction went before the Wisconsin legislature to seek state funding for support of the local pilot projects in its 1985-87 biennial budget. The Teaching Incentives Pilot Project has been included in Governor Earl's proposed budget at $1,000,000 for each year of the 1985-87 biennium. This funding is earmarked for the costs of implementing proposed innovations in the way teachers are trained and in the way they are recognized for their contributions.

In February 1985, the State Superintendent, upon the recommendation of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program Advisory Board, selected eight local projects for participation in the pilot program. Balance was achieved in characteristics such as size of district and geographical location. Currently, Incentives Program staff is working with these eight districts to assist them in their implementation process. On March 5, 1985, an orientation meeting was held whereby representatives from the pilot districts were brought together to exchange ideas and to develop a network support system. Summaries of the proposals of the eight pilot districts follow.

Summaries of the Proposals of the Eight Selected Pilot Sites

Black Hawk School District

Black Hawk School District is located in the southwestern portion of Wisconsin along the Illinois-Wisconsin border. The district encompasses 375 square miles and includes the villages of South Wayne, Gratiot, Woodford, and Wiota. The economy of the school district

consists primarily of family dairy farms, cheese factories, and other agriculturally-related businesses. Black Hawk has a certified staff of 50.5 teachers, administrators, and CESA employees serving a K-12 enrollment of 686 students.

The incentives program proposed by the Black Hawk School District is a comprehensive project that includes training level innovations, a career ladder for teachers, and awards for excellence. The major objectives of Black Hawk's training level incentive are to introduce prospective teachers to the profession in their freshman or sophomore year of college, extend the field experience to 18 weeks, and provide qualified staff as supervisors for student teachers. Their career ladder is an attempt to improve both the quality of the profession and the attractiveness of the teaching profession through a different method of compensating teachers. Finally, Black Hawk intends to provide recognition of excellence through mini-grants, inservice, curriculum development, and community recognition. The various incentives would allow the school district to better utilize existing staff, award teachers who demonstrate superior performance in and out of the classroom, and establish a model that would allow for more effective staff development.

Cedarburg School District

The Cedarburg School District, located twenty miles north of the city of Milwaukee, is a suburban community of approximately 9,000 residents. The enrollment of the Cedarburg School District is 2,618. Cedarburg has a history of being an innovative district willing to cooperatively work towards excellence in education. Last year Cedarburg was one of fourteen schools nominated for High School/Middle School of the Year in Wisconsin.

The Cedarburg proposal is the only proposal that specifically addresses the issue of performance bonuses. Cedarburg is designing a salary incentive model for two bonus levels: (1) the building principal's nomination bonus and (2) a performance bonus. Qualifications for the principals' and performance bonuses will be based on four career levels. Each level includes academic degree requirements, professional improvement requirements, and the teacher's annual evaluation. In addition to the monetary bonuses, Cedarburg will investigate the possibility of recognizing outstanding teacher performance by awarding tuition grants, re-training grants, sabbatical leaves, attendance at seminars and clinics, research grants, extended contracts, awards to teaching teams or departments to pursue special projects, and mini-grants for classroom materials, exploration, and field trips.

McFarland School District

The McFarland School District, located in a small village just two miles southeast of Madison, has a total enrollment of 1,410 students. Because of its proximity to Madison, the majority of people in this community travel to Madison for employment. The school district, which has long been receptive to innovative approaches to education, was the first applicant to submit a proposal for the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program.

The incentives project proposed by the McFarland Community Schools is a comprehensive effort that includes three major elements: a program for preparing quality teachers using a one year residency/induction program for first-year teachers; a program to recognize and reward teachers who pursue challenging professional responsibilities, staff development opportunities, and community outreach; and a program to develop a career ladder model for teachers. McFarland's career ladder is an attempt to encourage

specialization and reward those who assume additional responsibility in leadership, instructional improvement, professional development, staff supervision, curriculum development, and program evaluation.

Platteville School District

The School District of Platteville, located in southwestern Wisconsin near the Iowa-Wisconsin border, is centered in a small city of approximately 10,000 population. The school district is the second largest employer in a basically rural setting, with the largest employer being the University of Wisconsin-Platteville. The Platteville Public Schools serve an enrollment of 1,800 students.

The Platteville proposal is a comprehensive professional development program. This program includes: performance assessment, professional staff development, a training level/teacher preparation component, and a recognition and reward system. The professional development program, which incorporates a career ladder model, seeks to provide renewal and reinforcement for all practicing educators, refinement and reinforcement for the beginning educator, and remediation and reinforcement for the struggling educator. The professional development program is one of four major goals contained in Platteville School District's overall plan for instructional improvement.

Rhinelander School District

Rhinelander School District is located in the northeastern section of Wisconsin. The school district supports a 9-12 senior high school, a 7-8 junior high school, nine elementary schools, and districtwide special education programs. There are 3,500 students K-12 served

by a staff with a full-time equivalency of 210 teachers. The district enjoys the reputation of being alert to new ideas and of being a leader in educational change and innovation.

Rhinelander's teaching incentives proposal is an attempt to develop strategies and criteria needed to enhance both the quality of teaching and the appeal of the teaching profession. This will be accomplished through financial incentives as well as non-salary forms of recognition for teachers. Rhinelander's basic objectives are: to assist in the development, encouragement, and implementation of innovation in teacher education; to develop and implement a teaching incentives pay plan (e.g. career ladder or teacher specialist program); to develop an award/reward system for enhancing the salary of career teachers; and finally, to develop and implement other programs which reward the accomplishments of teachers in both salary and non-salary ways.

Superior School District

The School District of Superior is the twenty-second largest school system in Wisconsin. Superior is located in the far northwestern part of the state and is 150 miles away from any Wisconsin district of comparable size. It is also 350 miles away from the bulk of the special learning conferences and workshops offered for state educators. The district serves a student enrollment of 5,785 in a K-12 system.

There are two major goals for the Superior Teaching Incentives Pilot Program. The first is to attract, prepare and retain teachers. The second is to increase the professional growth opportunities available to Superior educators. Both of these goals will be pursued as a collaborative effort between the School District of Superior and the University of Wisconsin-Superior. To achieve these two goals, Superior plans to provide teaching orientation programs to interested high school seniors, develop a first-year teacher

induction program, provide modified sabbatical leaves, aid marginal teachers, conduct seminars dealing with professional growth opportunities, provide mini-grants, and expand teacher involvement in curricular development through extended contracts.

Waunakee School District

Waunakee School District is a suburban community located approximately fifteen miles northwest of the Madison Metropolitan area with a student population of 1,658. It is a community of 10,000 people with the hub, the city of Waunakee, consisting of 4,000 citizens. A majority of the community works in the Madison Metropolitan area. The Waunakee School District takes great pride in its schools, and a rich tradition exists that has been established over the years due to the combined efforts of the community, parents, school board, teaching staff and administrators.

The major thrusts of the Waunakee proposal are: to retain competent teachers; improve the quality of teaching; develop a method of teacher compensation based on ability, amount of responsibility and evaluation; and finally, to develop a staff inservice/development system designed to improve classroom instruction. The proposal will attempt to coordinate a salary plan with staff evaluations and staff development. It also includes a career ladder plan which calls for four teaching levels. This career ladder will consist of: probationary teachers (those in their first three years of employment); Level I teachers (those who have successfully completed their first three years of teaching); Level II teachers (those with two to three years of satisfactory evaluations at Level I and a masters degree or equivalent); Level III teachers (those with two to three years of satisfactory evaluations at Level II and a masters degree plus additional credits). Waunakee estimates it would take seven to ten years for a teacher to progress from entry to Level III. However, participation beyond Level I would be strictly voluntary.

West Bend School District

The West Bend School District is located forty miles northwest of Milwaukee with a student population of 6,208. It is a community of appromixately 22,000, forty percent of whom commute to Milwaukee for employment. West Bend Public School students consistently receive high honors in individual events and have captured national honors for both their state and school district. The district has an excellent school-community relations program and is known for its high standards and expectations for excellence in education.

West Bend's proposal includes all three components of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program which are to attract, prepare and retain competent teachers. The major goal of the teaching incentives program in West Bend is to enhance the quality of teaching and the attractiveness of the teaching profession in the West Bend Joint School District. West Bend intends to implement a career ladder with four levels, a mini grant program for teachers, and provide recognition of excellence in teaching. West Bend's career ladder will begin with student teaching, move to the associate/first-year teacher, then to the professional teacher/five-year license, and provide career teacher or master teacher options in the fourth level.

West Bend's mini-grant program will provide approximately thirty grants for teachers to select their own incentive. In addition, West Bend plans to provide recognition of excellence by providing a column in the local newspaper concerning teacher activities, increasing participation of teachers in the speakers bureau, promoting awards banquets, and so forth.

PHASE II - TRANSITION FROM PLANNING TO IMPLEMENTATION

Prior to the implementation stage, which will begin in August 1985, a second phase of planning activities is currently taking place. These efforts are designed to provide a solid foundation on which to base successful launching of the local pilot projects and are being funded by a second grant awarded from the Secretary's Discretionary Fund in 1984.

This phase, which began in October 1984, includes the following components:

1. Training of teachers as cooperating and mentor teacher specialists as the first step in the implementation of pilots of career ladder models for Wisconsin's elementary and secondary teachers;
2. Assessing the effectiveness of a teacher induction program which will serve to field test a formal assistance program designed to support first-year teachers during their entry into the profession;
3. Gathering and disseminating information to school districts on planning and implementing local incentives programs, including technical assistance to the districts as they implement incentives plans.

A. Master/Mentor Teacher Development Program

The State Superintendent's Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education recommended that a career ladder be established in Wisconsin schools consisting of four stages--associate teacher, professional teacher, teacher specialist, and career teacher. This career ladder model received the unanimous endorsement of the advisory board of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program. Many pilot districts incorporated this model in their own career ladder structures.

As noted in the final report produced by the task force, the career ladder model opens up a much wider range of opportunities than are presently available for teachers who prefer to remain in the classroom. The final report also notes that this model permits specialization, rewards competence, and confers status. Most importantly, however, it "enhances the quality of the education provided in our elementary and secondary schools by keeping a larger share of our more dedicated and competent teachers in the classroom" (Grover, 1984).

The position of teacher specialist is one stage of the career ladder model. One of the primary responsibilities, or area of specialization, envisioned for this position is that of working with student teachers and/or first-year teachers. A study of induction programs for beginning teachers conducted by Educational Testing Service for the National Institute of Education (Elias, Fisher and Simon, 1980) concluded that the best induction programs provide assistance through a teacher-tutor who acts as a mentor and monitors the development of the beginning teacher. Kenneth M. Zeichner, University of Wisconsin-Madison, also undertook a major study of teacher induction practices in the United States and Great Britain (Zeichner, 1979). He concluded that guidance and assistance by experienced teachers is a crucial element of successful induction programs and that these mentors should receive special training.

One of the major initiatives during Phase II of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program will be the training of master/mentor teacher specialists for career ladder pilot projects which will be implemented in Wisconsin during the 1985-86 academic year. This training began with the establishment in October 1984 of a workgroup that is designing a curriculum for the training program. This committee is composed of four teachers, two university professors (one from a private institution and one from a public institution), and two district level administrators. It is chaired by the director of the Teaching Incentives Pilot

Program. Writing of the curriculum will take place from February-May 1985. A one week summer workshop, to be held during July 1985, will provide instruction for master/mentor teacher specialists and will also include special training in performance assessment for teacher educators and principals who will become members of the teams established to provide assistance to first-year teachers.

Although the curriculum has not as yet been completed, it is anticipated that it will cover the following topical areas:

1. Adult education/counseling - communicating and working with the adult learner
2. Performance assessment - analysis of teaching
3. Current emphasis in preservice programs
4. Supervision and staff development
5. Problems of the beginning teacher.

In regard to performance assessment, it should be noted that the State Superintendent has appointed a workgroup to study the assessment of teaching performance--a response to the recommendation of the Task Force that criteria and procedures be established for the regular supervision and assessment of performance of all licensed professional personnel. The make-up of this workgroup is very similar to the master/mentor curriculum committee. It consists of four teachers, two professors (one from a private institution and one from a public institution), and two district level administrators. It is chaired by a staff person from the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

The report from the performance assessment committee is anticipated in April or May of 1985. At this point, the workgroup is focusing on seven topical areas for a

performance assessment instrument. The committee is working in subgroups to develop observable behaviors in each area. The general topical areas are as follows:

1. Planning/preparing for instruction
2. Knowledge of subject area
3. Implementation of the instructional plan
4. Classroom management
5. Classroom climate
6. Using evaluation to improve instruction
7. Professionalism.

Although there will be follow-up seminars for summer workshop participants, the Master/Mentor Teacher Development Program will terminate shortly after the summer workshop in July 1985. However, extensive evaluation will be undertaken by Incentives Program staff following the workshop to determine its effect upon the supervision practices of the master/mentor teacher specialists and other team members (i.e., principals and teacher educators).

B. Field Test of a First-Year Teacher Induction Program

Accounts of first year teachers of their induction into the profession indicate that the experience is often a traumatic one, and survival is frequently the beginning teacher's uppermost goal. Support and assistance are frequently nonexistant, leading many teachers to recall their first year of teaching as having been a "sink or swim" situation. In addition, the work load of beginning teachers differs very little, if at all, from that of experienced colleagues.

Educators are becoming increasingly aware that many academically able teachers are lost to the profession during their first year of teaching. They also recognize that a floundering teacher, concerned with his/her own survival, cannot provide the best possible classroom instruction. In summary, the need exists for the development of formal assistance programs for first-year teachers. Wisconsin's Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education recognized this need and recommended that the State Superintendent establish standards for an induction program for first-year teachers.

In a cooperative arrangement with the University of Wisconsin-Whitewater (UWW), the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program is involved in a field test of a teacher induction program that is designed to provide assistance and support to first-year teachers. The UWW First-Year Teacher Induction Experience was cited by the national study undertaken by Educational Testing Service for the National Institute of Education as one of 24 exemplary programs for beginning teachers in the United States. This induction program models many of the elements recommended by the Task Force report, including:

1. Released-time or a reduced teaching load for first-year teachers to provide opportunities for them to observe experienced teachers;
2. Provision for participation by the beginning teacher in workshops, seminars, or other formal and informal training arrangements;
3. Observation of the first-year teacher's performance by members of a team--a teacher educator, an administrator, and a peer teacher(s).

The Teacher Induction Experience is designed to provide guidance and supervision for a smooth transition into the teaching profession as well as assistance for improvement of teaching skills. The induction experience takes place in the school in which the first-year teacher is employed.

The field test of the Teacher Inductin Experience will provide the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program staff with a knowledge base regarding the induction of first-year teachers into the profession--knowledge about the kinds of problems they are experiencing and the types of assistance that are most effective in meeting the needs of the beginning teacher. This knowledge base is already being used to assist the pilot districts with the development of their induction programs for first-year teachers.

C. Technical Assistance/Information Dissemination

The third major initiative during Phase II of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program is two-fold--to provide continuing technical assistance to pilot districts as they refine their pilot project implementation plans and to gather and disseminate information about pilot project activities statewide. A variety of delivery systems are being utilized, including:

1. Distribution of printed materials
2. On-site visits by Incentives Program staff
3. Telephone consultation
4. Liaison with college/university campuses
5. Presentations to educational organizations and broader audiences
6. Publication of relevant articles.

Information dissemination efforts are aimed at providing districts statewide with information concerning specific Incentives Program implementation efforts. Personnel from the pilot districts are being encouraged to participate in this effort.

In order to encourage districts throughout the state to initiate their own incentives programs, it is anticipated that Wisconsin's Cooperative Educational Service Agencies (CESAs) will serve as the vehicle for developing a number of consortia throughout the state. The CESAs, which are intermediate educational agencies, serve as a link among school districts and between districts and the state. The CESAs will provide leadership and coordination serivces in bringing districts together for the purpose of sharing information about local incentives program initiatives.

CONCLUSION

The director of the Bureau for Teacher Education and Certification at the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction recently stated in a position paper: "It is my view that by far the most serious immediate and long-term threat posed to improving the quality of elementary and secondary education programs is our profession's inability to attract intelligent and talented young people to our college and university preparation programs." This statement suggests that the challenge faced by the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program is part of a larger effort in Wisconsin to develop a statewide perspective and program which responds to public demands for educational accountability, educational improvement, and the perceived necessity for upgrading teaching to make it more attractive as a profession. Both the State Superintendent's Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education and the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program Advisory Board have concluded that this effort should include the introduction of incentives at all levels of the teacher training and employment process. This effort, it is believed, will eventually lead to changes in the way teachers are rewarded for their efforts and will ultimately result in demonstrable improvement in elementary and secondary education for children in Wisconsin.

REFERENCES

Elias, P., Fisher, M. L., & Simon, R. Study of Induction Programs for Beginning Teachers, Volume III. Berkely, CA: Educational Testing Service, 1980.

Grover, H. J. Final Report of the State Superintendent's Task Force on Teaching and Teacher Education. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, 1984.

Zeichner, K. M. Teacher Induction Practices in the United States and Great Britain. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA: April, 1979.

MC/RC4

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN • DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
125 South Webster Street • Box 7841 • Madison, Wisconsin 53707

Herbert J. Grover, State Superintendent / B. Dean Bowles, Deputy State Superintendent

June 5, 1984

TEACHING INCENTIVES PILOT PROGRAM

PROCESS FOR SELECTION OF PILOT PROJECT SITES

I. INTRODUCTION:

The Department of Public Instruction requests that each school district interested in serving as a pilot site develop a proposal that describes its anticipated project. The proposal should be designed to document the application process described in II-A below and should address all elements listed under II-B. It should be as detailed as possible but should also provide a practical/functional framework for the district's planning and implementation of its pilot project. When submitted to DPI, the proposal should be accompanied by a copy of the attached transmittal letter.

Recognizing that not all districts are at the same level of readiness for development of a proposal, a phased-in procedure will be utilized to allow all districts sufficient time for the application process. The selection of pilot districts will be completed according to the following schedule:

August 15, 1984--Approximately one-fourth of the pilot sites will be selected from proposals postmarked or delivered by August 15. All other interested districts must file a nonbinding "Statement of Intent to Submit a Proposal" if they want to be considered at a later date.

October 1, 1984--Approximately one-half of the pilot sites will be selected from proposals postmarked or delivered by October 1. Those districts wishing to be considered at a later date must file a "Report of Progress Since Preliminary Statement."

December 1, 1984--The final one-fourth (approximately) of pilot sites will be selected from proposals postmarked or delivered by December 1. All proposals must be completed and submitted by the final deadline.

Project staff will be available to provide assistance to pilot applicants as time permits. Such assistance could include presentations to staff, consultative services for district development councils and pilot leaders, assistance in the completion of application materials, or other requested services.

II. APPLICATION PROCESS:

A. School District Development Council: School districts, private schools, and other education agencies interested in volunteering as pilot project participants will establish a school district development council. This group will provide leadership for the planning, implementation and evaluation of the pilot project at the local level. The council shall be composed of representatives of:

1. Teachers representative of those affected by the project

2. Administrators
The importance of administrator involvement and commitment to the project cannot be underestimated. Both short and long range successes will depend upon their commitment.

3. School board (members)
The support and commitment of school boards will be essential for the development of viable and lasting programs.

4. Community - parents, business/industry, organized labor, and nonparents
Community members are potentially strong allies of teacher incentive programs. Community understanding and support for teacher incentive projects will assist in developing and maintaining programs. In addition, individual community members may have relevant experiences and could serve as valuable resources for project development.

5. University/college personnel on a consultant basis as appropriate.

B. Application/Proposal for Incentives Project: Interested school districts/education agencies will develop and submit a proposal that will address the following topics:

1. Statement concerning the need for the selected teaching incentives pilot program.

2. Statement of the goals/objectives of the proposed incentives program.

3. Description of the proposed incentives pilot program.

4. Description of the planning process that was utilized to develop the proposal, including:

   a. List of persons/groups involved in developing the proposal and their qualifications.

   b. Organizational methods and procedures.

c. Activities (in sequence)

5. Description of the implementation plan, to include the following elements:

   a. Details of who will do what.

   b. Timeline

   c. Project budget and sources of needed resources.

   d. Description of district's current or proposed teacher evaluation system. (It is recognized that revitalizing teacher evaluation may be a goal of the project.)

   e. Description of district's current or proposed system of providing recognition for or rewarding teachers.

   f. Description of how the district's staff development program will be revised to provide support for the proposed incentives program.

   g. Details on how the new system will be phased in.

6. Description of the program evaluation process/procedures to be used.

7. Project Budget (A budget may include the following and/or other cost items.)

   I. Personnel
   II. Fringe Beneftis
   III. Activities (e.g., training, travel)
   IV. Equipment
   V. Supplies
   VI. Other (e.g., consultant, printing, postage)

8. Project Accountability

   Assign overall responsibility to a project director and list any other persons with subordinate responsibilities. (Resumes are requested for persons with major responsibilities.)

9. Completed transmittal letter (sample attached) which includes the signature of the district administrator, school board president, and teachers association/federation president certifying majority support of their members for the proposal and a copy of the resolution and vote tally.

C. Applications/proposals must be postmarked no later than the designated dates (see I. above).

III. SELECTION OF PILOT PROJECT SITES:

A. After receipt of each application/proposal, Incentives Program staff will review the submitted proposals on the basis of proposal quality. A staff member will visit the applicants that have submitted the most promising applications to evaluate the following:

1. Commitment of the school district (administrators, teachers, school board members and community) to participation as a pilot project site.

2. District experience/expertise with performance evaluation and staff development and with program evaluation. District's representative of a range of evaluation experience will be selected.

3. Indication of cooperation between the district and an institution of higher education for some phase of the project.

4. Indication of cooperation between the district and an institution of business/labor for some phase of the project.

5. Specific criteria to be considered in selecting the pilot sites as outlined in C. below.

B. After reviewing all project proposals, Incentives Program staff will present the results of the proposal review with their recommendations to the advisory board for their consideration.

C. The Incentives Program advisory board will select the pilot sites, basing their decision on the following criteria:

1. Diversity of district size, type of district (rural, urban) and geographical area (CESA district). The goal of the pilot program will be to include districts of a variety of sizes, type, and geographical area.

2. Type(s) of incentives project - Some of the selected projects will be chosen for their comprehensiveness so that they effectively link components of the incentives program.

3. Congruence of the goals/objectives of the proposed project with the goals/objectives of the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program.

4. Nature and scope of the organizational procedures and steps utilized in developing the proposal.

5. Feasibility of the implementation plan.

6. Assessment of the funding commitment and needs required for implementation.

7. Successful applicants will indicate a willingness to participate in an evaluation of the project to include both qualitative and quantitative criteria. Specific quantitative evaluation criteria (now being developed) may include such data as student/teacher absence rates and student performance.

8. Assessment of the extent to which the proposed project is in congruence with appropriately identified needs.

9. Assessment of the extent to which the goals/objectives are likely to be attained if this project is implemented.

10. Evidence of business/labor involvement in the development or implementation of the project.

D. The selection of pilot districts will be completed within six weeks of the designated submission dates (see III-F for funding contingency).

E. Amendments to the pilot proposal may be requested or accepted by the program advisory board either before or following the selection of pilot sites, providing all signatory parties also sign the amendment.

F. If necessary state legislation to fund the program is passed, implementation of funded incentives programs in selected districts will begin in the 1985-86 school year. However, school districts which are not selected to be funded to implement their incentives programs but have their own funding could develop programs for the 1984-85 school year. They, too, will have training and technical assistance available to them from DPI Teaching Incentives Pilot Program staff as time and resources permit.

P53B/G

SAMPLE FORMAT

(Use your school district letterhead.)

DATE

Dr. John A. Scott
Director, Teaching Incentives Pilot Program
Department of Public Instruction
P. O. Box 7841
Madison, WI 53707

Dear Dr. Scott:

The purpose of this letter is to express interest on the part of our school district to become involved in the Teaching Incentives Pilot Program which will be operated by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

We have reviewed the available information about this program and have arrived at the following conclusions:

1. The School District of _____ is hereby submitting its formal request to be included in this program effort.

2. Our district has selected a school district development council that will provide leadership for the planning, implementation and evaluation of a pilot project in our district.

3. Our district anticipates implementing a (training level/career ladder/awards for excellence) incentives program as outlined in the enclosed Project Proposal.

We understand that not all applicants will be selected to participate in this pilot effort as openings in training programs and incentive monies will be limited. We also understand that the announcement regarding acceptance of our school district as a pilot project site will be made within six weeks of the application deadline for which the proposal is submitted and that funding of pilots is contingent upon legislative approval.

(Signature of Administrator)
DISTRICT ADMINISTRATOR

(Signature of President)
TEACHERS' ASSOC. PRESIDENT

(Signature of President)
SCHOOL BOARD PRESIDENT